



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/676,211	10/01/2003	Chesley P. Dillon	GP-303949 2760/128	9698
7590	12/12/2005		EXAMINER	
General Motors Corporation Legal Staff, Mail Code 482-C23-B21 300 Renaissance Center P.O. Box 300 Detroit, MI 48265-3000			CAI, WAYNE HUU	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2681		
DATE MAILED: 12/12/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/676,211	DILLON, CHESLEY P.	
	Examiner Wayne Cai	Art Unit 2681	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 November 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to Amendment dated 11/29/2005.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant asserts that the Webb fails to disclose a "call center". The Examiner strongly disagrees with the assertion because the Applicant does not specifically describe exactly what the call center is, and the functionalities of the call center as recited in the independent claim. Therefore, the Examiner reasonably, and broadly interprets a "call center" as a center in which it provides call, communications, connections, and/or services. Hence, Webb discloses a gift reminder service provider, in paragraph 0027, as admitted by the Applicant (i.e., a service provider is the same as a call center.)

The Examiner greatly appreciates the Applicant in amending independent claims 1, 8, and 14 to clarify that the subscriber notification is sent using a wireless network. The Examiner also notes that Webb also teaches the subscriber notification is sent to standalone computing system 70 (paragraph 0030). The standalone computing system 70 is indeed designed as a wireless mobile computing device (see fig. 1, and its descriptions). Hence, it is inherent that the wireless network is being used in Webb's system.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-14, 16-20, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Webb (US 2002/0143664 A1).

Regarding claims 1, 8, 14, Webb discloses a method, a computer usable medium, and a system for notifying a subscriber of events, comprising:

- receiving an subscriber event request at a call center (i.e., gift reminder service provider) (paragraphs 0027);
- creating an event activation table based on the received subscriber event request (paragraphs 0028);
- sending the event activation table to an event table storage system (paragraph 0029, fig. 1, elements 42 & 44);
- sending a subscriber notification from the event table storage system in accordance with the event activation table using a wireless network (paragraph 0030).

Regarding claims 3, 10, and 16, Webb discloses the method, computer usable medium, and system of claims 1, 8, and 14 as described above. Webb

further discloses wherein receiving the subscriber event request comprises: receiving at least one event with an associated notification date and time (paragraph 0032).

Regarding claims 4, 11, and 17, Webb also discloses the method, computer usable medium, and system of claims 3, 10, 16 as described above. Webb also discloses wherein creating the event activation table comprises: linking the received event and the associated notification date and time with an access identifier (i.e., login/password) (paragraph 0028).

Regarding claims 5, 12, Webb discloses the method, and computer usable medium of claims 1, and 8 as described above. Webb also discloses wherein sending the event activation table to the event table storage system comprises: establishing a data connection between the call center (fig. 1, elements 30, 42, and 46) and the event table storage system (element 76) and transmitting the event activation table from the call center to the event table storage system using the data connection (paragraph 0030; fig. 1 and its descriptions).

Regarding claims 6, 13, and 18, Webb discloses the method, computer usable medium, and system of claims 4, 11, and 17 as described above. Webb also discloses wherein sending the subscriber notification comprises:

- reading a time signal of a real time clock (paragraph 0032);
- determining when the time signal corresponds with at least one date and time from the event activation table (paragraph 0032);

- activating an event notification system based on the determination (paragraph 0032);
- providing the event in accordance with the linked access identifier (paragraphs 0033-0034).

Regarding claims 7, and 19, Webb discloses the method, and system of claims 1, and 14 as described above, except for disclosing wherein the event table storage system is a telematic unit (fig. 1, element 70, and its descriptions).

Regarding claim 20, Webb discloses the system of claim 14 as described above. Webb also discloses wherein the event notification system is a multimedia system (figs. 5 & 6).

Regarding claim 22, Webb discloses a method of notifying a subscriber of events, the method comprising:

- receiving, from a subscriber at a call center facilitating communications to and from a mobile device, at least one event and at least one action associated with the event (paragraph 0027);
- determining the event (paragraph 0029);

transmitting a notification to the subscriber using a wireless network, the notification including instructions to perform action (paragraphs 0029-0030).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to

be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2, 9, 15, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webb.

Regarding claims 2, 9, 15, Webb discloses the method, computer usable medium, and the systems of claims 1, 8, and 14 as described above. Webb further discloses determining a current notification system activity (paragraphs 0029-0030), but except for disclosing suspending the current notification system activity for the duration of the subscriber notification, and resuming the current notification system activity upon termination of the subscriber notification. It is however obvious to one skilled in the art to include these features because during the process of notifying the current activity to user, the system should suspend and notify the particular activity; it then resumes the notification activity afterward for any other activity as needed.

Regarding claim 21, Webb discloses the method of claim 1 as described above, except the call center is a telematics call center facilitating communications to and from a mobile vehicle. However, Webb discloses a gift service provider in which it does the same functions as the call center. Webb does not specifically disclose a mobile vehicle. Webb, however, discloses a mobile device in which it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to use the mobile device as a device using or embedded in vehicle. Hence, this is not novel.

Art Unit: 2681

6. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webb in view of DeKock (US 2003/0225516 A1).

Regarding claim 23, Webb discloses the method of claim 22 as described above, except wherein the even is a traffic update at a predetermined time and the action includes tuning a radio receiver to a predetermined station.

In a similar endeavor, DeKock discloses a system for providing traffic information. DeKock also discloses wherein the even is a traffic update at a predetermined time and the action includes tuning a radio receiver to a predetermined station (paragraph 0059).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a traffic update only at a predetermined time so that user does not have to tune to a traffic channel at a certain time while driving.

7. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Webb in view of Liao (US 2003/0005466 A1).

Regarding claim 24, Webb discloses the method of claim 22 as described above, except wherein the even is a stock quote for a predetermined stock at a predetermined time, and wherein the action include retrieving a stock quote for the predetermined stock at the predetermined time and providing the stock quote to the subscriber within a mobile vehicle using a text to speech synthesizer.

In a similar endeavor, Liao discloses a content personalization system for mobile users. Liao also discloses wherein the event is a stock quote for a

Art Unit: 2681

predetermined stock at a predetermined time, and wherein the action include retrieving a stock quote for the predetermined stock at the predetermined time (paragraph 0006) and providing the stock quote to the subscriber within a mobile device using a text to speech synthesizer (paragraph 0062; fig. 1, element 48).

The Examiner also notes that even though neither Webb nor Liao discloses a mobile vehicle. It is however obvious to one skilled in the art to implement or embed a mobile device into a vehicle.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a stock quote at a predetermined time and use a text to speech conversion because it is more convenient for use to listen to the desired content while driving rather than stare at the display.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

Art Unit: 2681

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wayne Cai whose telephone number is (571) 272-7798. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday; 9:00-6:00; alternating Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild can be reached on (571) 272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Wayne Cai
Examiner
Art Unit 2681



ERIKA A. GARY
PRIMARY EXAMINER